CAPS Survey Report

Year:	2011
State:	Kansas
Cooperative Agreement Name:	Winter Moth and Gypsy Moth
Cooperative Agreement Number:	11-8453-1227-CA
Project Funding Period:	January 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011
Project Report:	CAPS Survey Report
Project Document Date:	January 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011
Cooperators Project Coordinator:	Laurinda Ramonda
Name:	Plant Protection and Weed Control Program
Agency:	Kansas Department of Agriculture
Address:	PO Box 19282, Forbes Field Bldg 282
City/ Address/ Zip:	Topeka, Kansas 66619
Telephone:	785-862-2180
E-mail:	laurinda.ramonda@kda.ks.gov

Quarterly Report	☐
Semi-Annual Accomplishment Report	☐
Annual Accomplishment Report	☒

A. Write a brief narrative of work accomplished. Compare actual accomplishments to objectives established as indicated in the work plan. When the output can be quantified, a computation of cost per unit is required when useful.*

Participants: Full time staff – Bob Buhler, Cherie Copeland, Tom Sanders for trapping and surveying.
Greg Chrislip, Entomologist – Trapping, surveying and sorting
Eric LaGasa, Entomologist Identifier (Domestic), Olympia, Washington – specimen identification

- Cooperative agreements were signed on August 22, 2011 and funding was received on September 12, 2011.
- Trapping and survey began October 4, 2011.
- Trapping and survey completed on December 27, 2011.
- 31 traps with 775 suspect moths sent to Eric LaGasa, entomologist, Washington State Department of Agriculture on December 28, 2011.
- Results from lab received February 6, 2012 – 689 specimens are *Operophtera bruceata* (Bruce spanworm), 83 are an undetermined *Noctuidae* (Owlet moth), 1 is an undetermined *Pyralidae* (Snout moth) and 2 were unidentifiable to family.
- 17 *Operophtera sp.* were sent to the University of Massachusetts for molecular analysis. These specimens are possible hybridized specimens between *Operophtera bruceata* and *Operophtera brumata*.

Funding Amount (USDA)	Funding Amount (KDA)	Total Number of Traps	Cost Per Unit
Proposed = $7,741	Proposed = $781	Proposed = 150	Proposed= $56.81
Actual = $7,741	Actual = $781	Actual = 150	Actual = $56.81

1. <u>Survey methodology (trapping protocol)</u>:

	Common Name	Scientific Name
Pest:	Winter Moth	*Operophtera brumata*
	Gypsy Moth	*Lymantria dispar*

	Proposed	Actual
Sites (Locations):	25	25
Traps:	150	150

	Proposed	Actual
Number of Counties:	15	13
Counties:	Butler-2, Crawford-2, Cherokee-2, Douglas-2, Finney-1, Ford-1, Geary-2, Jefferson-1, Johnson-2, Kingman-1, Pratt-1, Riley-2, Sedgwick-2, Shawnee-2 and Wyandotte-2	Butler-2, Crawford-2, Douglas-4, Ellis-1, Finney-2, Ford-1, Geary-1, Johnson-3, Kingman-1, Riley-2, Sedgwick-2, Shawnee-3 and Wyandotte-1

2. **Survey dates:**

	Proposed	Actual
Survey Dates:	October – December 2011	October 4, 2011 – December 27, 2011

3. **Benefits and results of survey:**

- 1 trap missing when removed.

	Positive	Negative	Total Number
Traps	0	149	149

4. **Database submissions:**
   - 31 traps with 775 suspect moths sent to the lab on December 28, 2011. Results received on February 6, 2012.

Records Submitted to NAPIS

Pest: WINTER MOTH

County	Positive	Negative
Butler	0	6
Crawford	0	12
Douglas	0	24
Ellis	0	6
Finney	0	12
Ford	0	6
Geary	0	6
Harvey	0	6
Johnson	0	18
Kingman	0	6
Reno	0	6
Riley	0	12
Sedgwick	0	5
Shawnee	0	18
Wyandotte	0	6
State Total	**0**	**149**

Pest: Gypsy Moth **Survey Method: Visual**

County	Positive	Negative
Butler	0	1
Crawford	0	2
Douglas	0	4
Ellis	0	1
Finney	0	2
Ford	0	1
Geary	0	1
Harvey	0	1
Johnson	0	3
Kingman	0	1
Reno	0	1
Riley	0	2
Sedgwick	0	1
Shawnee	0	3
Wyandotte	0	1
State Total	**0**	**25**

Records Submitted to IPHIS

Activities for Gypsy Moth

Survey Name	Survey Situation	County Name	Service Activity Date	Activity Method	Survey Name	Survey Situation	County Name	Service Activity Date	Activity Method
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Butler	2011-10-12	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-10-31	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Butler	2011-11-03	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-11-30	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Butler	2011-12-16	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-10-11	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Crawford	2011-10-10	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-11-01	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Crawford	2011-11-08	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-12-06	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Crawford	2011-12-15	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-10-11	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Crawford	2011-10-10	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-10-11	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Crawford	2011-11-08	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-10-31	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Crawford	2011-12-15	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-11-30	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-10-11	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Kingman	2011-10-13	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-11-07	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Kingman	2011-11-17	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-12-16	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Kingman	2011-12-16	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-10-11	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Reno	2011-10-11	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-11-07	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Reno	2011-11-17	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-12-16	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Reno	2011-12-16	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-10-11	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Riley	2011-10-10	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-11-07	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Riley	2011-11-07	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Douglas	2011-12-16	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Riley	2011-11-29	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Ellis	2011-10-14	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Riley	2011-10-11	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Ellis	2011-11-01	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Riley	2011-11-07	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Ellis	2011-12-01	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Riley	2011-11-29	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Finney	2011-10-12	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Sedgwick	2011-10-07	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Finney	2011-11-14	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Sedgwick	2011-12-16	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Finney	2011-11-28	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Sedgwick	2011-10-07	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Finney	2011-10-12	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-10-12	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Finney	2011-11-14	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-11-04	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Finney	2011-11-28	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-12-05	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Finney	2011-11-28	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-10-04	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Ford	2011-10-13	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-11-04	VISUAL

Gypsy Moth	Detection	Ford	2011-11-15	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-12-02	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Ford	2011-12-06	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-10-07	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Geary	2011-10-10	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-11-04	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Geary	2011-11-07	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Shawnee	2011-12-05	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Geary	2011-11-29	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Wyandotte	2011-10-06	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Harvey	2011-10-12	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Wyandotte	2011-11-03	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Harvey	2011-12-16	VISUAL	Gypsy Moth	Detection	Wyandotte	2011-12-01	VISUAL
Gypsy Moth	Detection	Johnson	2011-10-10	VISUAL					

B. If appropriate, explain why objectives were not met.*

- Cherokee, Jefferson and Pratt County did not have suitable sites for traps.
- Ellis County was added.
- More traps were placed in Douglas, Finney, Johnson and Shawnee County.
- Less traps were placed in Geary and Wyandotte County because not enough suitable sites.
- 1 trap was missing when removed.

C. Where appropriate, explain any cost overruns or unobligated funds in excess of $1,000. *

indicates information is required per 7 CFR 3016.40 and 7 CFR 3019.51

Approved and signed by

_____ Date: _____

Cooperator

_____ Date: _____

ADODR